

SESSION #3

2017-11-03

Filename: FM2-118

Comment on the semantics of *tipaq*: Nisa says “we see the movement when we use *tipaq*” → there is a clear semantic difference, maybe similar to difference between IOC and DOC in English. See (a) and (b)

- (a) Aku peritoq kamu balé
 ‘I show you a house’
 -straightforward DOC in AV here
- (b) aku peritoq balé tipaq kamu
 ‘I show a house to you’
 -IOC in AV: Nisa says it feels a bit different, like a different emphasis. Not surprising, given the semantics of *tipaq*

Side note:

- Austin --working paper, vol 2--(2000, p. 18) notes a **person hierarchy** in Sasak that does not have the same effect in Ampenan Sasak in (1)
- (x) Ali gitaq aku
 ‘Ai saw me’
 -OK in Ampenan Sasak, but Austin’s observation for his variety is that this should be passivized because the Agent is lower than the Patient

DOCs in AV using ‘promise’

- (1) kamu janjiq aku buku no
 ‘you promise me the book’
 -example of underived ditransitive
- (2) *kamu janjiq buku no tipaq aku
 ‘you promise the book to me’
 -not very natural, b/c of pragmatics: It’s odd to put a pronoun with *tipaq* at the end of the clause
- (3) aku janjiq ie buaq
 ‘I promised him some fruit’
 -this one’s OK, like (1)
- (4) *aku janjiq buaq tipaq ie
 ‘I promised some fruit to him’
 -Nisa says it’s “the same as the weird one” (2). Pronouns seem dispreferred with *tipaq*
- (5) inaq no janjiq anak=ne sepéde
 ‘the mother promised her son a bicycle’

-here =ne is possessive morphology. This is just a regular DOC in AV using 'promise'

DOCs in PV with 'promise'

- (6) siq=bi janjiq aku buku no (7) siq=mèq janjiq aku buku no
'you (FEM) promise me a book' 'you (MASC) promise me a book'

For (6) and (7), PV acts as expected: The agent is cliticized. (8) and (9) illustrate this further, by showing that *siq* is reserved for A.

- (8) *siq=ku kamu janjiq buku no
'You promise me a book'
-Cannot cliticize R with *siq* in PV, because the A goes with *siq*
- (9) *siq=n kamu janjiq aku
'You promise me a book'
-Cannot cliticize T with *siq* in PV, because the A goes with *siq*

Passivization with 'promise': Both R and T can get promoted to subject position

- (10-16) are passivized DOCs

- (10) ie te-janjiq buku no (siq kamu)
'He was promised the fruit (by you)'
-Nisa says this feels weird for pragmatic SAP reasons
- (11) anak=ne te-janjiq sepéde (siq inaq=ne)
'her son was promised a bicycle (by his mother)'
-Here R is clearly promoted to the subject.
- (12) sepéde te-janjiq=ne (siq inaq=ne)
'The bicycle was promised him (by his mother)'
-Here T is clearly promoted to the subject.
- (13) guru no janjiq murid=ne sepéde
'The teacher promise his student a bicycle'
-Just setting up the passive with a canonical AV DOC ditransitive here
- (14) guru no janjiq kanak no buku
'the teacher promises the boy a book'
-Agauin, just setting up the passive with a canonical AV DOC ditransitive here
- (15) Kanak no te-janjiq buku
'The child was promised a book'
-R promoted to subject position

- (16) buku te-janjiq kanak no
 'the book was promised the boy'
 -Here T promoted
- (17) buku te-janjiq tipaq kanak no
 'A book was promised to the boy'
 -Here we've got an IOC passivized. T is promoted, R is with *tipaq*
- (18) buku te-janjiq-**an**=ne siq guru no
 *'A book was promised him by the teacher'
 -Nisa says this is "still understandable, but ...". The presence of -an causes a problem
 -I'm not sure why I did a verb with PASS + -an + a clitic. I forgot why this came up.
- (19) buku te-janjiq-**an** aku
 *'a book was given to me'
 -The presence of -an again makes it weird. Nisa says it sounds like "a Javanese" speaking Sasak → I think this is getting at the fact that PASS *te-* de-transitivizes the verb, and so adding applicative morphology (i.e., a valency-increasing morpheme) creates a problem.